



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of Things-as-they-Would-Be. In this vein Herr Révai denounces the economic system of today root and branch, and to our complete enlightenment on the subject nothing is lacking save a companion volume surveying with an eye no less jaundiced the communistic system he recommends as so much better.

The root of all social discord and misery is, it appears, the institution of private property. The system founded thereon is a pitiable failure even as a scheme of production. It does not get the right man into the right place, it does not spur each to do his best, it produces too much of one commodity and too little of another. Then, too, it jars upon the moral sense. With division of labor and exchange, property loses the ethical character it has in a simple society where objects remain in the possession of the maker. The persistence of theft after centuries of preaching proves there is something against nature in the command "Thou shalt not steal." By the same token why not argue from the persistence of rape that there is something unnatural in giving a woman control of her own person? In the presence of the rank growth of property rights beyond the sanction of moral desert or social welfare Révai calls for the axe, while soberer thinkers bid society apply the pruning hook in the form of factory legislation, anti-monopoly decisions, or inheritance taxes.

Our author is, in fact, one who hankers for better bread than can be baked from wheat. There is hardly any ill of life, save unrequited love and old age, that he does not lay at the door of our economic system. As he inveighs against competition as well as monopoly or inheritance, scouts the idea of over-population and denounces the "prudential check" in the family, it becomes clear that the real malefactor is not Private Property but the Struggle for Existence. With this slight correction the economist can accept the indictment and pronounce the verdict "Guilty as charged!"

EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA.

Les causes de la dépopulation de la France. By G. CAUDERLIER.

Paris: Guillaumin & C^{ie}, 1901. (2d edition.) 8vo, pp. 51.

THIS brochure is rather a strange product of a mind presumably trained in the exact science of engineering. It attempts to formulate a law of all the movements of population, valid in all places and all times—an effort at over-generalization which smacks strongly of the

eighteenth century. The law, as formulated, is that population increases whenever the resources of the community are in excess of its requirements, and tends to decrease when its resources are insufficient to satisfy its needs. The law may be conveniently expressed, without insistence on the exact mathematical relation, by the formula :

$$\text{Population} = \frac{\text{Resources}}{\text{Needs}} .$$

Now it is true, and indeed obvious, that the movement of population is dependent in considerable degree on the two factors of the resources of the community and its needs or requirements, according to the standards of life prevailing within the given social group at the given time. If this were the meaning of Cauderlier's formula it would be neither novel nor especially open to criticism. But to state the formula, even in this modified form, as the sole law of population is preposterous. Marriage and birth-rates are influenced by a multiplicity of causes, some obscure and some perfectly obvious, some within direct human control and some wholly beyond it. The requirements of professional or trade education, as influencing the age of marriage, the legal status of marriage and divorce, the degree of race intermixture, and, in general, the qualitative condition of the population, may be mentioned as among the influences which should be taken into account. Factors that are especially potent toward the decrease in birth-rate throughout most civilized countries are the economic independence of women, the substitution of the flat or apartment for the separate home, the increase in luxury and travel, and perhaps more than all, the spread of physiological knowledge which transfers the whole matter largely from the domain of instinct to that of conscious human control.

It is difficult to see how a student who has taken the pains to study population statistics that Cauderlier has taken—as shown by his two elaborate volumes, *Les lois de la population et leur application à la Belgique*, and *Les lois de la population en France*—can so completely ignore other factors as to formulate a universal law on the sole basis of resources and needs. And it is still stranger, in view of the fact that he regards the needs of any community as relatively constant. Now needs, in the sense of the actual necessities of life, no doubt change slowly, but these are not the needs that limit population, for a decreasing birth-rate has come with an increasing degree of comfort. On the other hand, the class of needs that do affect the birth-rate—the

needs of luxury, enjoyment, culture, and personal expression generally — these develop and vary with great rapidity and in accordance, often, with mere passing fads or whims. If Cauderlier uses “needs” in the sense of necessities, he is wrong in assuming that they greatly limit population; if he uses needs in the sense of desires for something beyond mere necessities, he is wrong in assuming that they are but slightly variable.

It should be said that, on the whole, Cauderlier is not so bad as his law. He is, in a way, a victim of a tendency toward over-generalization, from which, however, he sometimes escapes in treating particular aspects of the subject. Particularly is this true in the case of his analysis of the effects of migration on birth-rate, and in the case of his argument that death-rates depend not so much on economic conditions as on the degree of observance of the laws of hygiene.

C. C. CLOSSON.

The Scotch Irish; or, The Scot in North Britain, North Ireland, and North America. By CHARLES A. HANNA. New York: 1902.

Two volumes, 8vo, pp. xi + 623 and iv + 602.

EXTREMELY valuable for its wealth of statistico-historical details as to the influence of the Scotch stock, particularly in America, this work is nevertheless fundamentally misleading in its assumption of a sharp racial distinction between the Scotch and the English peoples. The difficulty springs in part from the old mistake of classifying populations according to the accident of prevailing language instead of according to physical characteristics. It is half-unconsciously assumed that the Celtic-speaking population of Scotland was of the same race as the Celto-Slavs of the continent. Thus in enumerating the statesmen of Scottish descent who have occupied the White House Hanna remarks: “This list is instructive in showing that one-half of our presidents have been to a large extent of Celtic extraction.” If this means simply that their ancestors may have spoken a Celtic dialect, the statement is unobjectionable, but unimportant. If it means, as it seems to mean to the author, and would no doubt mean to the casual reader, that these presidents of Celtic extraction were essentially of different race-stock from those of English ancestry, it is misleading. As Hanna himself points out, the so-called Scotch-Irish are Irish only by residence, not by any appreciable degree of intermixture with native stock. Racially they are Scotchmen, whatever that may be found to